



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

My attention has been called to the fact that in A. J. P. XXXV 17, n. 3, I misinterpreted certain words which I quoted from Mr. J. W. Duff's book, *A Literary History of Rome*, 124. I refer to the words "he does not maintain the fidelity of the familiar opening words:—*Virum mihi, Camena, insece versutum*". I see now, what I should have seen before, that Mr. Duff meant to tell us that, in his judgment, Livius' opening line, in contrast to other lines by him, was a faithful rendering of the Greek. I am sorry that I failed to see this, particularly because I have a very high opinion of Mr. Duff's book. Yet I may say in self-defence that to insert as a subordinate element of a discussion of a man's inaccuracies (a discussion which covers 15 lines) a reference to one excellent and faithful rendering seems to me unfortunate. Had I caught Mr. Duff's true meaning I should of course have begun my note in a different way, but I am constrained to say that the main part of it, the part beginning "The number of fragments whose place is uncertain" would be unchanged. Our studies of early Latin literature will remain untrustworthy so long as we keep forgetting that even Archimedes needed a *ποῦ στῶ*.

CHARLES KNAPP.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

Pröbuerunt.

I ask leave to protest against the statement on p. 410 (post-script) of the last number of the *American Journal of Philology* that "metrical stress . . . brought about the portentous 'probuerunt'", in my version of Professor Housman's 'Epitaph on an Army of Mercenaries' published in the *Literary Supplement of the Times* of Nov. 8, 1917.

In the line in question

rerum probuerunt ob aes ruinam

I originally wrote a different verb which I changed in order to give the Lucretian colour that seemed to suit the subject and the original. Of the two passages which I cited one (I 977) contains a form *probeat* = *prohibeat* which may be maintained to be due to 'metrical stress' and one (III 864) a form *probet* which cannot; for it is not to be supposed that Lucretius could not get *prohibet* into his verse. A more reasonable supposition is that *probeo* is a contraction of the same kind as *praebeo* and *debeo* and that the scansion *pröbuerunt* would not have seemed more 'portentous' to Lucretius than the scansion *præbuërun*t seemed to Ovid, *Amores* I 14.